

REMARKS

Applicant sincerely appreciates the courtesy of the telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney on August 26, 2005. During the interview we discussed the Examiner's comments regarding the arguments in the "Claims Presented" portion of the Detailed Action and the differences between the access-prevention device of the present invention and the Key-View PC disclosed in the cited *Anderson et al.* reference. We agreed that two significant differences between the device of the access-prevention device of the present invention and the Key-View PC are that (1) the switching means of the access-prevention device of the present invention are implemented by hardware, whereas the switching functions of the Key-View PC are implemented by computer programming and (2) the Key-View PC is more complex than the access-prevention device of the present invention and performs a number of functions that are not performed by the access-prevention device of the present invention.

The independent claims are amended to recite that the switching means of the access-prevention device of the present invention are "hardware-implemented". Support for this recitation is set forth in the Specification at page 10, lines 19-22, page 12, line 21 to page 13, line 21, page 14, lines 10-13 and 21-23, page 15, lines 1-4 and 20-23, page 16, lines 9-12, page 17, lines 4-7, page 17, line 23 to page 18, line 3, page 18, lines 13-20, page 19, lines 15-19, page 20, lines 4-11, page 21, lines 7-10 and 20-22, page 22, lines 1-4 and in FIGS. 4A and 4B of the Drawing.

The claims are also amended by deleting the term "discrete" that was added by a previously filed amendment. Upon reviewing the dictionary definition of "discrete", it was determined that the term "discrete" could be misconstrued. The term "discrete" was not in the original specification.

The relative simplicity of the access-prevention device of the present invention is defined by use of the transitional phrase "consisting of" in the independent claims.

Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24 are also amended to be more definite by reciting that the control terminal is connected to the switching means to provide the given control signal to the switching means from the control device.

Dependent Claims 15 and 26 are also amended to be more definite by changing "a given control signal" to "said given control signal, inasmuch as there is an antecedent basis for "given control signal" in the independent claims from which Claims 15 and 26 respectively depend.

The Summary of the Invention portion of the Specification is amended to be consistent with the amended independent claims.

With regard to the Detailed Action, the Examiner's withdrawal of the prior rejection of claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is gratefully acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4

To the extent that the rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by *Anderson et al.* is applicable to currently amended Claims 1-4, such rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

The Key-View PC disclosed by *Anderson et al.* is not a simple access-prevention device consisting of

- a first connector for connection to a given port,
- a second connector for connection to a network,
- hardware-implemented electrically powered switching means connected in series between the first and second connectors and operable in response to a given control signal for preventing receipt by the first connector of any network communications from the second connector and/or for preventing receipt by the second connector of any network communications from the first connector, and
- a control terminal connected to the switching means for providing said given control signal to the switching means from an external source,

as recited in currently amended Claim 1. Instead, the Key-View PC is a complex device that is implemented by computer programming for performing a number of functions that are not performed by the elements of the access-prevention device that are recited after the transitional phrase "consisting of" in Claim 1.

The elements of a typical Key-View PC and the many functions performed by the Key-View PC are described in *Anderson et al.* at column 11, line 34 to column 85, line 67. In addition, any access-prevention switching function performed by the Key-View PC is implemented by computer programming instead of by hardware-implemented switching means, as required by Claim 1.

In addition, Applicant respectively disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that the Key-View PC is a control terminal in the same (or an equivalent) sense as the control terminal recited in Claim 1, for which the only support in the present application is control terminal 29.

The access-prevention device recited in Claim 1 would not have been suggested by *Anderson et al.* to a person of ordinary skill in the art because (1) the primary thrust of *Anderson et al.*'s teaching is the enabling of remote access between a given network-connected computer and another computer within the network rather than the selective prevention of such access, as provided by the access-prevention device of the present invention, and (2) *Anderson et al.* do not suggest any motivation for providing the simple access-prevention device recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly Claims 1-4 are patentable over *Anderson et al.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 5-9

To the extent that the rejection of Claims 5-9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* is applicable to currently amended Claims 5-9, such rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

The inventions recited in currently amended dependent Claims 5-9 are patentable over *Anderson et al.* and *Thacker* for the same reasons as submitted above for the patentability of Claims 1-4 and the reasons submitted in the Amendment filed on July 30, 2004 for rebutting the Examiner's assertions set forth in the Office Action of July 2, 2004.

Accordingly Claims 5-9 are patentable over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker*.

Claim 10

To the extent that the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker* is applicable to currently amended Claim 10, such rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

The Key-View PC disclosed by *Anderson et al.* is not a simple access-prevention device consisting of

- a first connector for connection to a given port,
- a second connector for connection to a network, and
- hardware-implemented switching means connected in series between the first and second connectors for preventing receipt by the first connector of any network communications from the second connector and/or for preventing receipt by the second connector of any network communications from the first connector,

as recited in currently amended independent Claim 10. Instead, the Key-View PC is a complex device that is implemented by computer programming for performing a number of functions that are not performed by the elements of the access-prevention device that are recited after the transitional phrase “consisting of” in Claim 10.

The elements of a typical Key-View PC and the many functions performed by the Key-View PC are described in *Anderson et al.* at column 11, line 34 to column 85, line 67. In addition, any access-prevention switching function performed by the Key-View PC is implemented by computer programming instead of by hardware-implemented switching means, as required by Claim 10.

The access-prevention device recited in Claim 10 would not have been suggested by *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker* to a person of ordinary skill in the art because (1) the primary thrust of *Anderson et al.*’s teaching is the enabling of remote access between a given network-connected computer and another computer within the network rather than the selective prevention of such access, as provided by the access-prevention device of the present invention, (2) *Thacker* is not related to access prevention, and (3) neither *Anderson et al.* nor *Thacker* suggest any motivation for providing the simple access-prevention device recited in Claim 10.

Accordingly Claim 10 is patentable over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker*.

Claims 11-26

To the extent that the rejection of Claims 11-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker* is applicable to currently amended Claims 11-26, such rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

The Key-View PC disclosed by *Anderson et al.* is not a simple access-prevention device consisting of

- a first connector for connection to a given port,
- a second connector for connection to a network,
- hardware-implemented electrically powered switching means connected in series between the first and second connectors and operable in response to a given control signal for preventing receipt by the first connector of any network communications from the second connector and/or for preventing receipt by the second connector of any network communications from the first connector, and
- a control terminal connected to the switching means for providing said given control signal to the switching means from an external source,

as recited in currently amended independent Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24. Instead, the Key-View PC is a complex device that is implemented by computer programming for performing a number of functions that are not performed by the elements of the access-prevention device that are recited after the transitional phrase “consisting of” in Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24.

The elements of a typical Key-View PC and the many functions performed by the Key-View PC are described in *Anderson et al.* at column 11, line 34 to column 85, line 67. In addition, any access-prevention switching function performed by the Key-View PC is implemented by computer programming instead of by hardware-implemented switching means, as required by Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24.

In addition, Applicant respectively disagrees the Examiner’s assertion that the Key-View PC is a control terminal in the same (or an equivalent) sense as the control terminal recited in Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24, for which the only support in the present application is control terminal 29.

The access-prevention device recited in Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24 would not have been suggested by *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker* to a person of ordinary skill in the art because (1) the primary thrust of *Anderson et al.*’s teaching is the enabling of remote access between a given network-connected computer and another computer within the network rather than the selective prevention of such access, as provided by the access-prevention device of the present invention, (2) *Thacker* is not related to access prevention, and (3) neither *Anderson et al.* nor *Thacker* suggest any motivation for providing the simple access-prevention device recited in Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24.

Accordingly Claims 11, 18, 21 and 24 and the claims depending from these claims are patentable over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker*.

Prior Arguments Regarding Claims 5-26

The reasons for rejecting 5-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker* that were set forth in the Office Action mailed January 21, 2005 and incorporated by the Examiner in the Office Actions mailed April 21 and July 29, 2005 were the same reasons as set forth for rejecting these claims in the Office Action mailed July 2, 2004. In the Office Action mailed November 24, 2004, the Examiner responded to the arguments made by Applicants in the Amendment filed July 30, 2004 in response to the Office Action of July 2, 2004. Notwithstanding the Examiner's response to such arguments, Applicants stand by such arguments and do not agree with the Examiner's assertions that the various combinations of features recited in the rejected claims would have been unpatentable over *Anderson et al.* in view of *Thacker*.

In addition, with regard to the Examiner's assertion in paragraph 8 of the Response to Arguments portion of the Office Action mailed January 21, 2005, Applicants do not understand how the Examiner can assert that a cubical workstation is a computer chassis.

Conclusion

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 8-30-05



Edward W. Callan
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 24,720

Customer No. 22653
Telephone: (858) 259-5533
Facsimile: (858) 259-5537
Email: ecallan1@san.rr.com